UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/671,548	09/29/2003	Akira Murakawa	018775-877	7496
	7590 08/19/200 INGERSOLL & ROOI	EXAMINER		
POST OFFICE	BOX 1404	GEE, JASON KAI YIN		
ALEXANDRIA	A, VA 22313-1404	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2434		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/19/2009	ELECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ADIPFDD@bipc.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/671,548	MURAKAWA, AKIRA	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	JASON K. GEE	2434	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 03 August 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS AF	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperfor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ar no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FII	on. LED WITHIN TWO
chave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of the standard of the standard from: (1) the expiration date of the standard from: (1) the expiration date of the standard from in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origi than three months after the mailing dat	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in completing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a content of the proposed amendment of the present additional claims without canceling a content of the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be assumed that the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be assumed to place the application in better a final rejection, be assumed to place the application in better a final rejection, be assumed to place the application in better a final rejection, be assumed to place the application in better a final rejection, be assumed to place the application in better application in the place the application in better application in the place the application in better application in the place the the	nsideration and/or search (see NO w); ter form for appeal by materially red	ΓE below); ducing or simplifying tl	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).  4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12  5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			
<ul> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> <li>For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:</li> </ul>	☐ will not be entered, or b) 🛛 wil	•	-
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-12, 17-20, 22-24, and 28-33</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation		•	
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	,	condition for allowan	ce because:
12.	P10/56/08) Paper No(s)		
/Michael J Simitoski/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2439	/Jason K Gee/ Examiner, Art Unit 2434		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In regards to the 112 rejection about the computer readable medium, these rejections will be withdrawn.

In regards to the 112 rejection regarding claim 32 about functioning as a printer, these arguments are not persuasive. Instead of merely citing the medium having the ability to print or the medium being a printer, the applicants use the language "functioning as a printer." It is unclear what the applicants are really trying to limit the claims to here. A printer can function for many different purposes other than printing.

The regards to the 103 rejections, the applicants argue that the references do not teach signing the secone certificate with the private key used to sign the root certificate. However, this is taught throughout the reference and explained in the office action. As shown in Benussi, in paragraph 214, digital certificates are signed with private keys. The digital signing of a certificate with a private key allows anyone with the public key of the certificate authority to confirm that the certificate is genuine. As seen in paragraph 25 of Smetters, the laptop (12(1)) generates a root key pair or uses an existing root key pair, and generates a root certificate, which is digitally signed by the root private key. In paragraph 31, the laptop 12(1) creates a second laptop certificate, which, is the same as the root certificate. Again, in order to create a certificate, it must be signed with a private key. The laptop 12(1) uses the same key to generate a second certificate. The applicants are arguing that Smetters does not teach sending a private key, but this is unnecessary as the laptop 12(1) is the one creating both the certificates. Further, sending private keys are contrary to the principles of cryptography. Also, as indicated in paragraph 25 of Smetters, the laptop 12(1) can generate root certificates using preexising root key pairs. As indicated in paragraph 31, the second certificate is the same as the root certificate, except as described herein. The exceptions are taught in paragraph 32 and 33, wherein the laptop 12(2) specifically indicates that it wishes to use a particular key. The applicants point how this differs than the recited art. However, paragraphs 25 and 31 teaches all the limitations, and the exceptions do not have to be reached in paragraphs 32 and 33 because the second laptop does not need to request a particular key if it does not wish to do so. Thus, the same private key is being used.